



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,814	11/25/2003	Farid Adrangi	P17494	8004
25694	7590	03/10/2006		EXAMINER
INTEL CORPORATION P.O. BOX 5326 SANTA CLARA, CA 95056-5326				EKONG, EMEM
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2688	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,814	ADRANGI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	EMEM EKONG	2688	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-6, 9-14, and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,321,090 B1 to Soliman in view of U. S. Publication No. 20040264414 A1 to Dorenbosch.

Regarding claim 1, Soliman discloses a method of dynamically detecting a location of a mobile node (col. 5 line 35-col. 6 lines 12), comprising: examining information pertaining to the mobile node (col. 6 lines 39-49, col. 12 lines 47-67, col. 13 lines 46-51, and col. 14 line 50-55, distance between the base station and wireless unit can be used in determining the location of the wireless unit);

selecting a location module based on the information (col. 13 line 51-col. 14 line 40, and col. 14 line 50-col. 16 line 63, in the case of direct line-of-sight between base station and the wireless unit only two satellite range measurements are needed);

and executing the location module to determine whether the mobile node is on an external network (col. 4 lines 56-66).

However, Soliman fails to disclose executing the location module to determine whether the mobile node is on an intranet network.

Dorenbosch discloses executing the location module to determine whether the mobile node is on an intranet network (pars. 17-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Soliman, and have the location module to determine whether the mobile node is on an intranet network as disclosed by Dorenbosch for the purpose of detecting position of the mobile devices for facilitating a possible network handoff.

Regarding claim 9, Soliman discloses an article comprising a machine-accessible medium having stored thereon instructions that, when executed by a mobile node (col. 13 line 65-col. 14 line 33), cause the mobile node to: examine information pertaining to a mobile node (col. 6 lines 39-49, and col. 13 lines 46-51, distance between the base station and wireless unit can be used in determining the location of the wireless unit); select a location module based on the information (col. 13 line 51-col. 14 line 40, and col. 14 line 50-col. 16 line 63, in the case of direct line-of-sight between base station and the wireless unit only two satellite range measurements are needed);

execute the location module to determine whether the mobile node is an external network (col.4 lines 56-66).

However, Soliman fails to disclose execute the location module to determine whether the mobile node is on an intranet network.

Dorenbosch discloses execute the location module to determine whether the mobile node is on an intranet network (pars. 17-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Soliman, and have the location module to determine whether the mobile node is on an intranet network as disclosed by Dorenbosch for the purpose of detecting position of the mobile devices for a possible network handoff.

Regarding claim 17, Soliman discloses a mobile node capable of dynamically determining its location (col. 5 line 35-col. 6 lines 12, and col. 13

lines 65-67), comprising: a memory capable of storing a configuration database containing static information pertaining to the mobile node (col. 7 lines 1-11), the memory further capable of storing dynamic information obtained when the mobile node starts up (col. 7 line 62-col. 8 line 65); and a processor capable of executing an appropriate location module selected by a policy engine (col. 6 lines 39-49, and col. 13 line 65-col. 39), the appropriate location module selected by the policy engine based on the static information and the dynamic information (col. 14 line 40-col. 16 line 63), wherein the appropriate location module is capable of causing the mobile node to determine whether it is on an external network (see table 1, and col. 4 line 56-col. 5 line 11).

However, Soliman fails to disclose wherein the appropriate location module is capable of causing the mobile node to determine whether it is on an intranet.

Dorenbosch discloses determining whether the mobile node is on an intranet network (pars. 17-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Soliman, by determining whether the mobile node is on an intranet network for the purpose of detecting position of the mobile devices for a possible network handoff.

Regarding claims 2-6, 10-14, and 18-22, the combination of Soliman and Dorenbosch discloses the method, an article, and a mobile node according to claims 1, 9, and 17 wherein examining the information pertaining to the mobile

node further comprises examining information from a configuration database and examining dynamic information obtained when the mobile node starts up

(Soliman, see table 1, col. 7 lines 1-10, col. 7 lines 62-67, and col. 8 lines 45-57);

 further comprising deciding whether to retain the location module based on the dynamic information (col. 7 line 62-col. 8 line 8);

 wherein deciding whether to retain the location module further comprises selecting an alternate location module if the dynamic information indicates the alternate location module is more suitable (col. 13 line 45-col. 15 line 37, and col. 16 line 51-col. 17 line 7);

 wherein applying the location module further comprises causing the mobile node to execute instructions in the location module (col. 14 lines 1-33, and col. 16 line 51-col. 17 line 7);

 wherein causing the mobile node to execute instructions in the location module further comprises causing the mobile node to register with an internal home agent and an external home agent (col. 17 lines 9-37);

 wherein the processor is further capable of causing the policy module to select a first location module based on the static information in the configuration database, and wherein the processor is further capable of causing the policy engine to determine whether to retain the first location module (col. 7 lines 1-10, col. 7 line 62-col. 8 line 8, and col. 17 lines 9-37)

5. Claims 7, 15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soliman in view of Dorenbosch and further in view of U. S.

Publication No. 2004/0037260 A1 to Kakemizu et al..

Regarding claims 7, 15, and 23, the combination of Soliman and Dorenbosch discloses the method according to claim 5, however, the combination fails to disclose wherein causing the mobile node to execute instructions in the location module further comprises examining a Dynamic Host Control Protocol ("DHCP") reply to determine a domain name.

Kakemizu et al. discloses wherein causing the mobile node to execute instructions in the location module further comprises examining a Dynamic Host Control Protocol ("DHCP") reply to determine a domain name (par. 122).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination, by causing the mobile node to execute instructions in the location module further comprises examining a Dynamic Host Control Protocol ("DHCP") reply to determine a domain name as disclosed by Kakemizu et al. for the purpose of having different addresses as mobile node roams on different network.

6. Claims 8, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soliman in view of Dorenbosch and further in view of U. S. Publication No. 2006/0018296 A1 to Mukaoka et al..

Regarding claims 8, 16, and 24, the combination of Soliman and Dorenbosch discloses the method according to claim 5, however, the combination fails to disclose wherein causing the mobile node to execute instructions in the location module further comprises causing the mobile node to

compare its care of address ("COA") against a CIDR block address in a configuration database.

Muraoka et al. discloses compare its care of address ("COA") against a CIDR block address in a configuration database (pars. 0125-128).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination, by comparing the address ("COA") against a CIDR block address in a configuration database as disclosed by Muraoka et al. for the purpose of updating the database.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to the location method:

U.S. Pat. No. 6522888 B1 to Garceran et al.

U.S. Pub. No. 20040203786 A1 to Ishiguro et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6674403 to Gray et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6038444 to Schipper et al.

U.S. Pub. No. 20030035387 A1 to Kim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EMEM EKONG whose telephone number is 571 272 8129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Mon-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571 272 7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



EOE
3/3/06



NICK CORSARO
PRIMARY EXAMINER